

REMARKS

The Office Action of March 10, 2006 was received and carefully reviewed. The Examiner is thanked for considering the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1-45 are pending in the instant amendment, of which claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 32-34 are independent. By this amendment, independent claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 32-34 have been amended.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admittance of prior art (hereafter AAPA) in view of Ernstoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,090,219 – hereafter Ernstoff), Ohwada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,750,813 – hereafter Ohwada), and Hata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,439,837 – hereafter Hata). Further, claims 10-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, and Hata, and further in view of McDowell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,262 – hereafter McDowell). Still further, claims 32-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata and Konno et al. (U.S. Patent 5,327,229 – hereafter Konno). Finally, claims 35-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ernstoff, Ohwada, Hata, and further in view of McDowall.

In the rejection, the Examiner asserted that Ernstoff, which is commonly cited in all of the rejections, discloses the frame comprises 2 fields and the switching means supplying power to the light sources in Fig. 10. In response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 3, 6, 9, and 32-34, as shown above, so as to further distinguish the presently claimed invention over Ernstoff. More specifically, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 6 so as to recite a feature “wherein said n subframes respectively include backlight (i.e., LED) turn-on period and backlight (i.e., LED) turn-off period in which a video signal is written into the pixels”.

Further, Applicants have also amended claims 1, 9, and 32-34 so as to additionally recite “writing a video signal for one of the red image, the green image and the blue image, and turning on the corresponding one of the red, the green and the blue backlight after finishing the writing of the video signal”.

Applicants note that, in the invention recited in amended claims 32-34, both the video

signal and the backlight are mono-color. Specifically, amended claim 32 includes the feature of turning on the red LED after finishing the writing of the red video signal, claim 33 includes turning on the green LED after finishing the writing of the green video signal, and claim 34 includes turning on the blue LED after finishing the writing of the blue video signal.

In order to express a gray-scale, the subframes R, G, B respectively include backlight (LED) turn-off period in which the image is written into the pixels, as supported on page 19, line 18 to page 19, line 18 and Fig. 6 in the specification.

In contrast, Ernstoff appears to disclose that any one of R, G, B source lights turns on, constantly, and a color frame (a frame) does not include source light turn-off period, as shown in Fig. 10 of Ernstoff. Thus, the reference fails to disclose backlight (LED) turn-off period in which the image is written into the pixels. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the amendment distinguish the present invention further distinguishes over Ernstoff.

Applicants respectfully submit that AAPA, Ohwada, Hata, and Konno also do not teach, disclose or suggest the amended features.

The requirements for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness, as detailed in MPEP § 2143 - 2143.03 (pages 2100-122 - 2100-136), are: first, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference to combine the teachings; second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success; and, finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. As the cited prior art references fails to teach, disclose or suggest all of the claimed features, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Applicants have further amended claims 1, 3, 6, 9 and 32-34 to delete the feature directed to the n-speed field sequential color signal generation circuit. Further, Applicants have amended claim 6 so as to parallel claim 3. Specifically, claim 6 further recites the feature wherein the display section displays a plurality of frames in one second, each of which comprises n subframes, where n is an integer of 2 or more, and wherein each of said n subframes comprising a red image, a green image and a blue image.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-45 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do

Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000